APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/442,150	11/18/1999	REINER KRAFT	AM9-99-0095	5474

			EXAMINER
48146	7590	04/20/2006	PATEL, DHAIRYA A

MCGINN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP, PLLC
8321 OLD COURTHOUSE ROAD
SUITE 200
VIENNA, VA 22182-3817

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2151	

DATE MAILED: 04/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/442,150	KRAFT ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Dhairya A. Patel	2151	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>19 January 2006</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-9 and 11-33</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1,2,5-7,11-14,22-25,27-32</u> is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) <u>3,4,8,9,15,16,26 and 33</u> is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communication filed on 1/19/2006. Claims 1

-2,5-7,11-14,22-25,27-32 are rejected. Claims 17-21 are allowed. Claims

3,4,8,9,15,16,26,33 are objected. Claim 10 is cancelled.

2. This amendment has been fully considered and entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act

of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical

Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting

directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000.

Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior

to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

3. Claims 11-14,22-25,27,29-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as

being anticipated by Martin et al. U.S. Patent # 6,272,484 (hereinafter Martin)

As per claim 11, Martin teaches a method of processing search results obtained

in response to a user query, the method comprising:

-examining document pointers returned by a search engine to identify a source from which documents are available, each said document pointer including a Uniform Resource Locator (URL) (column 8 lines 44-67);

-obtaining said documents from said source (column 8 lines 44-67);

-generating a visual abstract for each of said documents, each visual abstract being a thumbnail image, each said thumbnail image comprising a visual similarity of said document as reduced in size, a title (Fig. 6 element 613 "XYZ NEWS") of said document ensured to be readable on each said thumbnail image (Fig. 6 element 607 or "stored image file") (column 7 lines 34-40)(column 9 lines 39-67)(column 10 lines 1-19);

-formatting a stream of data such that when said data is displayed on a display screen, each visual abstract appears adjacent to a corresponding search result (Fig. 5 &Fig 6)(column 10 lines 11-33)(column 8 lines 43-67); and

-creating a larger visual abstract (Fig. 6 element 607 or "stored image file")of at least one of said documents (column 8 lines 6-16).

As per claim 12, it teaches same limitations as claim 6, therefore rejected under same basis.

As per claim 13, it teaches same limitation as claim 5, therefore rejected under same basis.

As per claim 14, it teaches same limitation as claim 7, therefore rejected under same basis.

As per claim 22, Martin teaches a method of searching for a document, said method comprising:

-supplying a search request (column 8 lines 44-67);

-providing abstract of documents on a screen display that correspond to said

search request (Fig.5 element 515,513 A-F), said abstracts including a written abstract

that contain a summary of contents of said documents and a first visual abstract of each

of said documents (column 8 lines 43-67);

-creating a second visual abstract of one of said documents, each said first visual

abstract and said second visual abstract respectively being a thumbnail image (Fig. 6

element 613) of said document, wherein said second visual abstract (Fig. 6 element

603, 605) is larger than said first visual abstract(column 9 lines 39-62); and

-displaying said second visual abstract when requested by a user (column 8 lines

6-16).

As per claim 23, it teaches same limitation as claim 2, therefore rejected under

same basis.

As per claim 24, Martin teaches the method of claim 23, wherein said first portion

corresponds to at least one of a title and heading of said document (fig. 6 element "XYZ

NEWS").

As per claim 25, Martin teaches the method of claim 22, wherein said second

visual abstract is displayed on said display screen when said user moves a pointing

device over a corresponding one of said first visual abstracts (column 8 lines 6-16).

As per claim 27, Martin teaches the method of claim 22 further comprising:

-storing data relating to said second visual abstract in a cache database (Fig. 6

element 603 "C:\Image.MAX")(column 9 lines 43-47, lines 62-67)(column 10 lines 1-9).

As per claim 29, it teaches same limitation as claim 22, therefore rejected under same basis.

As per claim 30, it teaches same limitation as claim 22, therefore rejected under same basis.

As per claim 31 and 32, it teaches same limitations as claims 23,25 respectively, therefore rejected under same basis.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-2,5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin et al. U.S. Patent # 6,272,484 (hereinafter Martin)) in view of Borman et al. U.S. Patent # 6,226,655 (hereinafter Borman).

As per claim 1, Martin teaches a method of processing search results obtained in response to a user query, the method comprising:

-providing document pointers returned by a search engine to identify a source from which documents are available, each said document pointer including a Uniform Resource Locator (URL) (column 8 lines 44-67)(column 9 lines 46-56) displayed as part of a search result by said search engine

-generating at least two visual abstracts (Fig 6 element 613)(Fig.6 element 603) for a least one of said documents, each of said two visual abstracts being a thumbnail

(Fig 6 element 613) image of a different size (Fig. 6 element 603)(column 7 lines 34-40)(column 9 lines 39-67)(column 10 lines 1-19); and

-formatting a stream of data such that when said data is displayed on a display screen regarding said at least one of said documents, a smaller one of said visual abstracts appears adjacent to a corresponding search result (Fig. 5 & Fig 6)(column 10 lines 11-33)(column 8 lines 43-67).

Martin fails to teach each document pointer including a Uniform Resource locator (URL) displayed as part of search result by said search engine.

Borman teaches each document pointer (Fig. 5A element 510,512,514) including a URL(Fig. 5A element 516, 518) displayed as part of search result (Fig. 5A element 506) by said search engine (Fig. 5A element 400,404, 506)(column 7 lines 50-67)(column 8 lines 1-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention was made to implement Borman's teaching in Martin's teaching to come up with having document pointer displayed as part of search result by search engine. The motivation for doing so is because the user would know which corresponding URL will be sent to by the browser to the Internet to access the specific file referred by URL and the user does not have to search for the URL again using the search engine (column 8 lines 16-21).

As per claim 2, Martin and Borman teaches the method of claim 1, but Martin further teaches wherein said visual abstract is generated after first manipulating said document so as to enhance a visibility of at least a portion of said document (column 7 lines 11-25).

As per claim 5, Martin and Borman teaches the method of claim 1, but Martin further teaches further comprising:

-displaying a larger one of said visual abstracts on said display screen when request by said user (column 8 lines 6-16).

As per claim 6, Martin and Borman teaches the method of claim 5, but Martin further teaches, further comprising:

-storing data relating to said larger on of said visual abstracts (column 9 lines 62-67)(column 10 lines 15).

As per claim 7, Martin and Borman teaches the method of claim 5, but Martin further teaches, wherein said larger one of said visual abstracts is displayed on said display screen when a cursor is moved over and said smaller one of said visual abstracts (column 8 lines 6-16).

5. Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin et al. U.S. Patent # 6,272,484 (hereinafter Martin) in view of Matsuyama et al. U.S. Patent # 6,567,177 (hereinafter Matsuyama)

As per claim 28, Martin teaches the method of claim 27, but is silent in teaching deleting said data relating to said second visual abstract in said cache database after a predetermined amount of time. Matsuyama teaches deleting said data relating to said second visual abstract in said cache database after a predetermined amount of time (column 35 lines 12-30) . It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to implement deleting data relating to second visual abstract from the cache database after a predetermined amount of time. The motivation

for doing so would be so that reduce the amount of image stored in the storage and to renew discard time (column 35 lines 12-30).

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 17-21 are allowed.

The prior arts of record do not teach nor suggest, either alone or in combination, **all** the limitations of claims of the current invention claims 17-21 particularly a method for processing search results to obtained in response to a user query, the method comprising determining whether a portion of a source document should be enhanced for visibility relative to another portion and manipulating said source document to have a portion to be enhanced so that one portion manipulated to degrade a visibility.

Claims 3,4,8,9,15,16,26,33 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 1/19/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

As per remarks, applicant stated the following:

A). applicant stated Martin does not teach or suggest "a method of processing search results obtained in response to a user query, the method comprising: providing document pointers returned by a search engine to identify a source from which documents are available, each said document pointer including a Uniform Resource Locator (URL) displayed as part of a search result by said search engine; generating at

least two visual abstracts for a least one of said documents, each of said two visual

abstracts being a thumbnail image of a different size; formatting a stream of data such

that when said data is displayed on a display screen regarding said at least one of said

documents, a smaller one of said visual abstracts appears adjacent to a corresponding

search result.

B). Applicant stated Martin does not suggest an "enhancement" of a portion of

the image before it is compressed.

C). Applicant stated Martin does not teach displaying a larger visual abstract.

D). Applicant stated Martin does not teach displaying a second larger visual

abstract.

E). Applicant stated for claim 27, that "C" drive is not a cache memory.

F). Applicant requested to provide a reference properly combinable with Martin.

As per remark A, Examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant because in

Fig. 5 element 515 and column 8 lines 53-67, Martin teaches having a search engine

(Fig. 5 element 515) and user may search for particular keyword/phrase (user query),

and then relevant electronic documents will provided (search results obtained from user

query). In column 8 lines 17-52, Martin teaches providing "XYZ NEWS" thumbnails

including abstract (document pointers) returned by search and knowing the source from

which he page/image file was received from (source from which documents are

available) and each pointer document included an URL (column 8 lines 17-25).

In column 7 lines 34-40 and column 9 lines 39-67 and column 10 lines 1-10,

Martin teaches having one thumbnail with smaller lower resolution (first visual

abstract)(fig. 6 element 613) and store image file (Fig. 6 element 601)(second visual

abstract) and each are thumbnail image of different size.

In Fig. 5 & Fig 6 and column 10 lines 11-33,column 8 lines 43-67, Martin teaches

displaying data such that data is displayed on the display screen (Fig. 6)(Fig. 5), and the

thumbnail image (smaller one of visual abstracts) appears adjacent to the search result

(Fig. 515 and 513A-F)(Fig. 6 element 615, 623,621). In Fig. 6, Martin teaches the

viewer code adjacent to the thumbnail image, and also text adjacent to the stored image

file (thumbnail image).

Martin fails to teach each document pointer including a Uniform Resource

Locator (URL) displayed as part of a search result by said search engine. Borman

teaches each document pointer (Fig. 5A element 510,512,514) including a URL(Fig. 5A

element 516, 518) displayed as part of search result (Fig. 5A element 506) by said

search engine (Fig. 5A element 400,404, 506). It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention was made to implement

Borman's teaching in Martin's teaching to come up with having document pointer

displayed as part of search result by search engine. The motivation for doing so

because the user would know which corresponding URL will be sent to by the browser

to the Internet to access the specific file referred by URL and the user does not have to

search for the URL again using the search engine (column 8 lines 16-21).

As per remark B, Examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant because in

column 7 lines 1-25, lines 34-41 Martin teaches the document is displayed thumbnail

correspond to the size of the respective application window opened by the user which

enhancing a visibility of at least portion of document because inherently the user opens

the application window big enough to enhance a visibility of the document, therefore

since the displayed thumbnail image correspond to the size of the window it, it would

have be enhanced to visibility of at least portion of said document.

As per remark C, Examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant because In

column 7 lines 34-40 and column 9 lines 39-67 and column 10 lines 1-10, Martin

teaches having one thumbnail with smaller lower resolution (first visual abstract)(fig. 6

element 613) and store image file (Fig. 6 element 601)(larger visual abstract) and each

are thumbnail image of different size.

As per remark D, Examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant, because no

where in the claim language does it say "a second, larger visual abstract". In the claim

6, it states "storing data to **SAID LARGER ONE** of said visual abstract". So according

to claim language said larger one of said visual abstract it means the first larger abstract

or the larger one of the claim 5, which is just one larger abstract not two.

As per remark E, Examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant, because the

claim states "cache database" not "cache memory" because it teaches storing in cache

database, since it says cache database and in cache database one can permanently or

temporarily store image in the drive, therefore Martin teaches storing in C: drive which

reads on the limitation of cache database.

As per remark F, please refer to the above claim 28.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

    A). "Electronic Document Manager" by Martin et al. U.S. Patent # 6,272,484.

    9. A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire **3 (three) months and 0 (zero) days** from the mail date of this letter. Failure to respond within the period for response will result in **ABANDONMENT** of the applicant (see 35 U.S.C 133, M.P.E.P 710.02, 710.02(b)).

    10.

    Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dhairya A Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-4066. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.

    If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zarni Maung can be reached on (571) 272-3939. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

    Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DAP

ZARNI MAUNG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER